

REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the Final Office Action dated June 15, 2009 in connection with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and a Petition for Extension of Time. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. All rejections and objections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 – 14, 29, and 36 – 43 are now pending in this application.

Claims 1 – 2, 29, and 36 have been amended.

Interview Summary

On September 10, 2009 the Applicant's attorney conducted a telephone interview with the Examiner. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for his time. The representative claim 1 and the cited references Slobodin et al., U.S. Publication No. 2003/0072429 (hereinafter "Slobodin"), Rodman et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0103864 (hereinafter "Rodman"), Watanabe et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,234,116 (hereinafter "Watanabe"), and Bear et al., U.S. Publication No. 2006/0006230 (hereinafter "Bear") were discussed. The Applicant drew the Examiner's attention to the limitation "***in response to the first adaptor receiving the start meeting command, causing, by the first adaptor, the first computer to send a start meeting message over the data network to a data center***".

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

At pages 2 – 7 of the Office Action, claims 1 – 7, 12, 29, 36, 38, 40, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Slobodin, in view of Rodman, in further view of Watanabe, in further view of Bear.

Claims 1 – 7, 12, 29, 36, 38, and 40

The Applicant's claim 1, representative in part of the other rejected claims, sets forth (emphasis added):

1. (Currently Amended) A method for initiating an online meeting over a data network between a host party with a first computer and an attendee party with a second computer, where a phone connection exists over a telephone network between a first phone of the host party and a second phone of the attendee party, the method comprising:

receiving a start meeting command at a first adaptor coupled to both the first phone and the first computer;

in response to the first adaptor receiving the start meeting command, causing, by the first adaptor, the first computer to send a start meeting message over the data network to a data center;
receiving, at the first adaptor from the first computer, a meeting identification that was generated by the data center;
storing the meeting identification in the first adaptor; and
transmitting the meeting identification from the first adaptor over the telephone network to a second adaptor, which is coupled to both the second phone and the second computer.

Slobodin discloses a “dataconferencing appliance [that] is connected to a data network that links the sites independently of the voice call network.” *See* Slobodin, abstract. To establish a data communication session between local and remote sites, a user activates a conferencing appliance which uses its internal telephone adaptor 140 to begin an access negotiation procedure. *See* Slobodin, paragraph 0051. As part of the access negotiation procedure, a “network device access code is communicated by generating an audio signal representative of the network device access code and transmitting it within the voice call session. In response to receipt of the audio signal at the second site, the access negotiation procedure of the dataconference control unit at the second site uses its network interface module and the received network device access code to join a data communication session between the sites via the data network....” *See* Slobodin, paragraph 0011. Figures 1, and 3 – 12 of Slobodin shows the connectivity between the dataconference appliances and the speakerphones.

Rodman discloses a technique for initiating and conducting a data conference between a plurality of conference endpoints linked in communication by a network. *See* Rodman, Abstract. “To initiate a data conference, one of the participating conference endpoints sends a conference initiation request over the network to a conference server...Upon receipt of the conference initiation request, the conference server generates a conference code that uniquely identifies the data conference. The conference code is transmitted over the network to the requesting conference endpoint.” *See* Rodman, paragraph 0012. Figure 1 of Rodman shows the connectivity between the conference endpoints and the network.

Watanabe discloses a communication system that transmits an animated character and its action from a transmitting side to a receiving side. *See* Watanabe, column 2, lines 37 – 40. The designated character performs the designated action on the screen of the receiving side. *See* Watanabe, column 2, lines 40 – 41. Further, “there is provided a communications system comprising a plurality of user terminals capable of communication using a predetermine communication software program and accessible to Internet....” *See* Watanabe, column 4, line 65 – column 5, line 2. Figure 7 discloses a flowchart of a procedure for starting up the communication software on a particular terminal. Specifically, a start-up message is transmitted from the user terminal to the administrator server. Figure 1 of Watanabe shows the connectivity between the terminals and the internet/network.

Bear describes a smart card interface device that generates fully authenticated access to a networked data server (e.g., mail, SMS, phone switch), for personalizing the access point behavior and notifying the data provider about the current location of the cardholder. *See* Bear, Abstract. Specifically, the smart card interface device “may be configured to be connectable ... between a phone handset and the telephone base.” *See* Bear, paragraph [0019].

The Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Slobodin, Rodman, Watanabe, and Bear does not teach or suggest the Applicant’s claimed “***in response to the first adaptor receiving the start meeting command, causing, by the first adaptor, the first computer to send a start meeting message over the data network to a data center***” and “***receiving, at the first adaptor from the first computer, a meeting identification that was generated by the data center.***”

While the Applicant claims that an adaptor, that receives a start meeting message, ***causes*** a computer to send a start meeting message over a data network, Slobodin, Rodman, Watanabe, and Bear are silent with respect to receiving a command at a first entity (e.g., an adaptor) which causes a second entity (e.g., a computer) to send a message.

In the Applicant's technique, a first adaptor is coupled to a first computer. When the first adaptor receives a start meeting command, the first adaptor *causes* (e.g., triggers) the first computer to send a start meeting message over the data network to a data center. Said differently, there is a causal link in the Applicant's technique where a start meeting command is received at a first entity, an adaptor, which then *causes* a different entity, a computer coupled to the adaptor, to send a start meeting message to a data center.

In contrast, Slobodin, Rodman, and Watanabe all disclose systems where one entity receives input to start a data conference/software, and that very same entity then sends the request to start the data conference/software. That is, none of Slobodin, Rodman, and Watanabe disclose a causal link between two entities where one entity receives a start meeting command which in turn causes a second completely different entity to send that start meeting command to a data center. Moreover, the Applicant notes that Bear also fails to address this aspect of the Applicant's claim and in fact makes no mention of an online meeting.

In contrast to the Applicant's claimed *"in response to the first adaptor receiving the start meeting command, causing, by the first adaptor, the first computer to send a start meeting message over the data network to a data center"* and *"receiving, at the first adaptor from the first computer, a meeting identification that was generated by the data center"*, Slobodin merely discloses a technique where a dataconference appliance receives input to start a data conference and then that same dataconference appliance begins a negotiation procedure over a voice network to start the data conference. See Slobodin paragraph [0051]. Thus, it is **one entity** in Slobodin that receives the input and then begins the negotiation procedure over the voice network. Therefore, the causal link between the adaptor and computer as is claimed by the Applicant, where the adaptor that receives the start meeting command causes the computer to send a start meeting message, is **not** present within the Slobodin reference. Further, Slobodin makes no mention of a first adaptor receiving from a first computer a meeting identification that is generated by a data center from the a first computer.

In contrast to the Applicant's claimed *"in response to the first adaptor receiving the start meeting command, causing, by the first adaptor, the first computer to send a*

start meeting message over the data network to a data center” and *“receiving, at the first adaptor from the first computer, a meeting identification that was generated by the data center”*, the local conference endpoint in Rodman does not cause a different entity/device to send a start meeting message over a data network. Instead, Rodman discloses a system where **one unit**, the conference endpoint, performs all the operations necessary to initiate a data conference. *See* Rodman, paragraph [0012] and Figure 1. That is, the conference endpoint is the entity that receives the initiation request (by depressing a single key) and is also the same entity that sends any requests to a conference server. *See* Rodman, paragraph [0012] and Fig. 2. As such, the causal link between the adaptor and the computer as is claimed by the Applicant, where the adaptor that receives the start meeting command causes the computer to send a start meeting message, is **not** present within the Rodman reference. Further, Rodman makes no mention of a first adaptor receiving from a first computer a meeting identification that is generated by a data center from the a first computer.

Moreover, the Applicant respectfully submits that Watanabe also **fails** to disclose receiving a start meeting command at one entity, an adaptor, which in turn causes a second entity, a computer, to send a start meeting message over the data network. The Examiner suggests that Watanabe teaches Applicant’s claimed *“in response to the first adaptor receiving the start meeting command, causing, by the first adaptor, the first computer to send a start meeting message over the data network to a data center* and *“receiving, at the first adaptor from the first computer, a meeting identification that was generated by the data center”*, at Figure 7 and at column 12, line 61 – column 13, line 40 of Watanabe. *See* Office Action, page 4. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Specifically, this portion of Watanabe discloses the manner in which the communication software is started, and states that “a start-up message is transmitted from the user terminal 5 or 6 to the administrator server 1.” *See* Watanabe, col. 13, lines 1 – 2 and Figure 1. “Upon receipt of the start-up message from the user terminal 5 or 6, the administrator server 1 accesses the ‘user information database’ and change the use status to ‘OnNet’.” *See* Watanabe, col. 13, lines 16 – 19. Thus, it is **one entity**, terminal 5 or 6 of Watanabe, that performs the process of starting up the communication software. Said

differently, the causal link between the adaptor and the computer as is claimed by the Applicant, where the adaptor that receives the start meeting command causes the computer to send a start meeting message over a data network, is **not** present within the Rodman reference. Further, Watanabe makes no mention of a first adaptor receiving from a first computer a meeting identification that is generated by a data center from the a first computer.

Finally, the Applicant submits that Bear also fails to address this aspect of the Applicant claim. In fact, the Applicant notes that Bear makes no mention of an online meeting of any sort. Instead, Bear simply describes a smart card device that can be utilized to generate fully authenticated access to a networked data server.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that a combination of Slobodin, Rodman, Watanabe, Bear does not teach or suggest the Applicant's claimed *"in response to the first adaptor receiving the start meeting command, causing, by the first adaptor, the first computer to send a start meeting message over the data network to a data center"* and *"receiving, at the first adaptor from the first computer, a meeting identification that was generated by the data center."*

Claim 43:

43. The method of claim 1, *wherein causing includes sending the start meeting command from the first adaptor to the first computer.*

The Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Slobodin, Rodman, Watanabe, and Bear does not teach or suggest the Applicant's claimed *"wherein causing includes sending the start meeting command from the first adaptor to the first computer."*

In contrast to the Applicant's claim, Slobodin, Rodman, and Watanabe all disclose systems where one entity receives input to start a data conference/software, and that very same entity then sends the request to star the data conference/software. That is, none of references send a start meeting command from a first adaptor to the first computer, which then sends the start meeting command to the data center.

At pages 7 – 9 of the Office Action, claims 8 – 11, 13 – 14, 39, and 41 – 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Slobodin in view of Rodman, in further view of Watanabe, in further view Bear, in further view of Lee et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,959,072 (hereinafter “Lee”).

Claims 8 – 11, 13 – 14, 39, and 41 – 42 are dependent claims that depend from independent claims believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, claims 8 – 11, 13 – 14, 39, and 41 – 42 are believed to be in condition for allowance, due to their dependency as well as for other separate reasons.

At page 9 of the Office Action, claim 37 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Slobodin in view of Rodman, in further view of Watanabe, in further view of Bear, in further view of Office Notice.

Claim 37 is a dependent claim that depends from an independent claims believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, claim 37 is believed to be in condition for allowance, due to its dependency as well as for other separate reasons.

Should the Examiner believe a telephonic interview would be helpful in the disposition of this Application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned attorney at (617) 951-2500.

In summary, all independent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance and therefore all dependent claims that depend there from are believed to be in condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully requests favorable action.

Please charge any additional fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account
No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,

/Omar M. Wadhwa/
Omar M. Wadhwa
Reg. No. 64,127
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP
88 BLACK FALCON AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02210
Telephone: (617) 951-2500
Facsimile: (617) 951-3927